

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
EASTERN DIVISION**

PRIM ADVISORS, INC.)	CASE NO.: 1:07CV3661
)	
Plaintiff,)	JUDGE JOHN ADAMS
)	
v.)	<u>ORDER</u>
)	(Resolving Document #38)
CHRISTIAN D. LAETTNER, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter appears before the Court on a motion for an in camera inspection of documents filed by Plaintiff Prim Advisors, Inc. For the reasons stated below, the motion is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

Plaintiff and Defendant reached an in-court settlement of this matter on February 13, 2008. Based upon that settlement, certain restrictions were placed on Plaintiff with respect to disclosures regarding Defendants. Plaintiff now asserts that it is obligated to disclose certain documents due to pending litigation in the Cuyahoga County Court of Common Pleas that may violate the settlement agreement. Plaintiff has indicated that it informed Defendants of this pending disclosure and that Defendants have asserted that a portion of the discovery will violate the terms of the settlement agreement. Plaintiff, therefore, requests that this Court review its pending discovery and determine whether disclosure is permissible.

The Court notes that it previously denied this request due to lack of specificity in the motion. Plaintiff has remedied that deficiency in this motion. Accordingly, to the

extent that Plaintiff has requested that the documents be reviewed, the motion is GRANTED. The Court has reviewed each of the documents.

The Court held a telephone conference on June 19, 2008, to address this motion. In so doing, the Court notified the parties that it would not order that the documents at issue be disclosed. The documents, at best, are tangentially related to the state court litigation in which Plaintiff seeks to disclose them. Furthermore, the parties were informed that producing these documents would lead to the imposition of sanctions as their disclosure would be in violation of this Court's orders. Accordingly, to the extent that the motion sought an order approving the disclosure of these documents, the motion is DENIED.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for an in camera inspection is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. The documents shall not be produced.

So ordered.

June 20, 2008

/s/ Judge John R. Adams
JUDGE JOHN R. ADAMS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT